



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,209	05/14/2007	Olivier Larcher	1022702-000319	6020
21839 7590 04/09/2009 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			EXAMINER HEVEY, JOHN A	
			ART UNIT 1793	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/09/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/589,209	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LARCHER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JOHN HEVEY	<b>Art Unit</b> 1793	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) JOHN HEVEY. (3) Scott Cummings.

(2) Jessica Ward. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 06 April 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 20, 33.

Identification of prior art discussed: Aozasa.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed claim interpretation of "consisting essentially of" and if claim language excludes the presence of cerium oxide, as taught by the prior art reference. No agreement was reached. The applicant plans to submit arguments rebutting the examiner's position that cerium would not materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed composition.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/J. H./ Examiner, Art Unit	/Jessica L. Ward/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793
-------------------------------	---